DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 199 UD 032 259

AUTHOR	Celio, Mary Beth
TITLE	Building and Maintaining Multischool Networks: Lessons To Be Learned from the Catholic Schools. Working Papers in Public Policy Analysis and Management. Draft.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle. Center on Reinventing Public Education.; Rand Corp., Santa Monica, CA.
REPORT NO	WP-94-12
PUB DATE	1994-05-20
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Working Papers, Graduate School of Public Affairs, DC-13, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195; phone: 206-543-4900.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; *Catholic Schools; *Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Information Dissemination; Models; *Networks; *Religious Organizations; *School Based Management; *Shared Resources and Services; Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

Well-developed models exist for the creation of multischool networks to promote the replication of effective practices beyond a single school. These networks are found in the Catholic schools. These networks are excellent models for the effective linkage of schools serving students of different socioeconomic and cultural groups in widely separated locations. This study describes networks developed by five Catholic orders: (1) the Jesuits; (2) the Irish Christian Brothers; (3) the Religious of the Sacred Heart; (4) the Holy Child Sisters; and (5) the Lasallian Christian Brothers. These are only a small, although very visible, part of the orders that have sponsored networks. There are reasons to believe that the religious sponsorship of these schools does not preclude the use of their experiences by other educational institutions and organizations. In each of these orders, the founder established an effective school and then was able to replicate it. Their experiences illustrate the importance of a clear vision of purpose, a mission. The importance of a sense of community is evident in the practices of these school networks. Some central services are provided for these networks, but decisions are made at the lowest appropriate level. There is an accountability system appropriate to the site-managed system, and this is a part of the body of experience that might be useful in the restructuring of public schools, and particularly urban schools, to work without a cumbersome central bureaucracy. (Contains 44 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 418 199

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christine Campbell
CRPE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BUILDING AND MAINTAINING MULTISCHOOL NETWORKS: LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM THE CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

By

Mary Beth Celio

This paper is a product of the Center on Re-Inventing Public Education, a collaboration between the Graduate School of Public Affairs Institute for Public Policy and Management and the RAND Corporation. A later version of this paper will be published by RAND.

DRAFT

BUILDING AND MAINTAINING MULTISCHOOL NETWORKS:

LESSONS TO BE LEARNED FROM THE CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Mary Beth Celio
Revised 5/20/94

This Draft is intended to transmit preliminary results of RAND research. It is unreviewed and unedited. Views or conclusions expressed herein are tentative and do not necesasarily represent the policies or opinions of the sponsor. Do not quote or cite this Draft.

I. INTRODUCTION

As national concern about the quality and effectiveness of public education has increased in recent years, reformers have continued to develop and to examine effective school practices and have begun to ask, with greater urgency, whether new organizational structures might be necessary to make any widespread difference in the state of education in America. Examples of effective schools receive wide publicity, and the school design teams sponsored by the New American Schools Development Corporation are expected to provide additional models for improving individual schools. However, the promise of meeting the challenges to public education through the provision of better models is likely to meet with as little success today as it has in years past. (Elmore and McLaughlin, 1988). Thus, there is growing interest in ways in which public school districts might be able to provide a greater choice of more effective schools though contracting with not-for-profit or profit making groups. Educational Alternatives Inc. is under contract to manage eight public schools in Baltimore, and its success is being closely watched. Whittle Communication's Edison Project is also looking for ways to develop networks of effective schools, rather than a single model school. As the New American Schools design teams continue with their work they, too, will be looking for ways to go beyond single-school models, to spread the benefits of what has been learned to more schools and districts.

Now that educational reformers are looking for new ways of replicating effective practices beyond a single school or small group of like schools, imagine a situation in which a number of different examples of multischool networks of schools would be readily available -- networks which have tried various approaches to school management, have survived the challenges of time and demographics and public scrutiny, and have established viable and effective schools in rural areas and inner cities, in upper income suburbs and middle-income industrial centers? Such models would be eagerly studied and copied. They could help prevent years of wasted efforts and could make it possible for new providers of public education to meet their challenges more rapidly and more effectively.

The purpose of this paper is to suggest that such well-developed models exist and that they are highly appropriate to the needs of those education reformers wishing to generalize their insights and models beyond single effective schools. These models are found in the multischool networks founded and conducted by orders of religious men and women (brothers, priests, sisters) in the Catholic Church. These networks provide excellent models for effective linkage of schools serving students of different socioeconomic and cultural groups in widely separated locations. Although there are examples in industry of such multi-site operations, these multischool networks sponsored by religious orders may constitute the only such models available at this time in education.

The multischool networks described in this study include those sponsored by the Jesuits, the Irish Christian Brothers, the Religious of the Sacred Heart, the Holy Child Sisters and the Lasallian Christian Brothers. But these are only a small (though visible) part of the hundreds of orders which have sponsored such networks. There are significant differences among the networks described here, but the commonalities are even more numerous. And if the story of their creation and development were told in modern language, it would contain many of the elements which current educational reformers seem to be advocating. Their common story would read something like this:

A strong educational/social leader identifies education as the primary need of the times. This reformer, convinced that current methods or approaches are not adequate to address the problems facing education, attempts a new venture. He/she gathers together a group of like-minded individuals who are willing to work together within the same vision. They draw up a plan of action and a document for the educational enterprise. This could be extremely specific (a day-by-day scope and sequence for every important subject area) or simply desired principles and practices.

Working from the key document, the founder trains others interested in the venture in the new ways of doing things. This training of the future teachers and leaders is often intensive and focuses on the development of attitudes and expectations as well as the acquisition of knowledge and skills. When these teachers/leaders are prepared, the new educational venture is begun. Although there is usually a "first" school, this is always followed very rapidly by others. The leaders of the individual schools, having been formed in the vision and principles of the reformer, are given great freedom to adapt the methods of the organization to the individual community to be served. These individual schools are then linked by the vision and by personal contact with the founder and, later, his/her successors and helpers.

With changes in time and circumstances, modifications are made in the founding documents and the training methods. But certain key elements remain, including adherence to the mission of the schools. There is constant reflection and revision as these are needed, with increasing involvement of parents and students in the running of the school as they gain the knowledge and interest in such involvement. At every point in the change, there is reference made to the first principles, to the founding vision.

Ignatius Loyola, Madeleine Sophie Barat, John de la Salle, Cornelia Conley and Edmund Rice did not think of themselves as educational reformers or founders of school systems. They did, however, see the need for new ways of providing education for their times and their countries and gathered companions and built schools to provide such an education. After hundreds of years, many of the schools they founded are still in existence,

although it would be unlikely that the founders would recognize them today. What has happened over the years is that these systems or networks of schools have found ways to replicate the original model, adapt it to current times and places, and then modify it in the light of new challenges. This history, this success, might provide some encouragement and some models for the educational reformers of today.

II. CAN CATHOLIC SCHOOL MODELS BE CONVERTED TO PUBLIC USE?

There are literally thousands of Catholic elementary and secondary schools throughout the United States, some opened as recently as last fall and others celebrating the bicentennials of their foundings. Catholic schooling is claimed, at one level or another, by literally millions of Catholic Americans and hundreds of thousands of non-Catholics, including Presidents of the United States, Supreme Court Justices, major league ball-players and, it seems, most of the stand-up comedians in the United States today. Although there are now thousands of other religious and nonsectarian private schools in the United States, the longest-lasting, most geographically diverse and most studied are those which fall under the general title "Catholic school." But, when it comes to educational reform, they are often pushed out of sight when models are sought for either curricular or organizational supports for more effective schools. It is the thesis of this report that the Catholic schools can, indeed, provide important information about the potential effectiveness of alternatives to current school organization.

The relationship between public and Catholic schools has gone through many phases, but has seldom been totally easy. In some cases, as in Oregon in the early 1900s, there have been attempts to eliminate Catholic schools entirely. Only a ruling by the Supreme Court (Sisters vs. the State of Oregon) prevented the Oregon law from spreading to other states. Some of the tension between the public and the Catholic schools may be attributable to the fear among public school supporters that tax moneys will be used to support Catholic schools, thus depriving public schools of needed financial support. And, in truth, Catholic school leaders and parents have long pointed out what they see as the inequity of paying twice for their child's education--once in the form of taxes and then in the form of Catholic school tuition.

The tension between Catholic and public school supporters heated up significantly in 1982 when the first reports from the High School and Beyond Study were published. This study, conducted by the National Opinion Research Corporation and sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics, reported that Catholic high schools were more effective than public and other private high schools, especially with low-income students from racial or cultural minorities. Protest and

reanalysis of the data were immediate. Whole journals were devoted to attacking one or another aspect of what became known as the Coleman Report.

In the midst of this academic flurry, however, school reformers saw in the study a confirmation of what many already believed: that high expectations for all students, additional homework, clear disciplinary policies and a caring faculty were characteristics of effective schools. (James and Levin, 1988). National magazines highlighted public schools which were adopting uniforms to improve school spirit and discipline; there was an added emphasis on parental involvement in the schools. Although these practices are certainly not unique in Catholic schools, the Coleman Report had pointed out the significant differences between public and Catholic high schools in their use of these practices and there were some indications that there might be a direct causal relationship between such practices and higher achievement, especially among high risk youth.

An attempt to go beyond disparate practices to see what public and private (particularly Catholic) school could learn from each other was embodied in a conference held on October 25 and 26, 1984. The conference had its origins in the Project on Comparing Public and Private Schools of the Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance (IFG), School of Education, Stanford University. Its main focus was to "ascertain how the two sets of schools are similar and differ and why each can learn from each other." (p. vii) Two volumes of papers issuing from this conference concentrated on describing the two sectors and then attempting to identify possible areas for learning.

Although the editors of the resulting publication described the conference as having a "constructive emphasis," three key papers openly questioned the very possibility of public schools learning from Catholic schools (Willms, Talbert, and Scott and Meyer in James and Levin, 1988). Brought down to simple terms, their conclusions were that the Catholic schools, although they may have done some good things, are really too different in structure and authority and purpose from public schools to be of any real use to them. There was no mention in any of these studies, however, of the networks which existed outside the geographically based diocesan school "district." And it is the experience of these networks which might be the most useful to today's public school planners.

A notable support for the idea of accepting Catholic schools as providing some form of modeling for public schools came from Chubb and Moe's 1990 study called Politics, Markets and America's Schools. Like the High School and Beyond study from which they drew much of their data, their contribution to the education reform debate sparked debates throughout the education establishment. Using the HSB data, along with other data

collected from the schools in that study, Chubb and Moe divided high schools according to performance (high or low), effectiveness of school organization , and degree of administrative constraint. According to their analysis, "High performance schools differ in goals, leadership, personnel, and educational practices from low performance school. Their goals are clearer and more academically ambitious, their principals are stronger educational leaders, their teachers are more professional and harmonious, their course work is more academically rigorous, and their classrooms are more orderly and less bureaucratic." (p. 99) They then go on to discuss school organization, and conclude that "All things being equal, a student in an effectively organized school should achieve at least a half year more than a student in an ineffectively organized school over the last two years of high school. If that difference can be extrapolated to the normal four-year high school experience, an effectively organized school may increase the achievement of its students by more than one full year. That is a substantial school effect, indeed." (p. 141).

What makes these findings important to the discussion here is that the high performance schools described by Chubb and Moe were disproportionately private and disproportionately Catholic. And yet the authors are straightforward in their contention that the results are relevant to the reform of public education and their defense of using Catholic schools in the analysis. In their words, "The kinds of qualities that contemporary school reformers would like public schools to develop, private schools have developed without external reform at all." (p. 182) In essence, they include these schools because they can provide a greater range of constraints, practices and policies than is found among public schools. In short, they can provide some models of organization and practice which are not found currently in the public sector. Not only are Catholic schools effective, the lessons they have learned in becoming effective can be of benefit to the public schools.

Once having established that the Catholic school experience may have something to offer to the public schools, it is still necessary to ask whether the success and survival of Catholic schools in the United States is due primarily to their connection with the Catholic Church. If this is the case, if in fact it is the religious element or sponsorship which accounts for all the variance between Catholic and other schools, then it is probable that school developers and reformers could learn little of benefit from their experience. However, there are reasons to believe that the religious sponsorship of the schools does not preclude the use of their experience by other educational institutions and organizations. And these reasons lie in the fact that virtually all of the elements of Catholic schools identified as contributing to their effectiveness are found in many other schools as well, private as well as public. The Catholic worldview or community may provide the "glue" which holds these elements together and permits them to be fully effective, but even this adhesive quality has found analogs in the public and other private schools.

Coleman and Hoffer identified the creation of "social capital" as central of the effectiveness of Catholic schools. (Coleman and Hoffer, 1987). They contend that the religious nature of the schools does, in fact, provide the foundation for its ability to create and maintain social capital because "the relations that surround a religiously grounded school are based on a single formal institution, the religious body." However, they also found similar patterns in some nonreligious-based schools that have another institution at the center, giving the example of university laboratory schools attended by faculty children. They also suggested the possibility of locating schools at the workplaces of one or both parents, thus taking advantage of the functional community which can exist there. In other words, although they identify the institutional Catholic Church as crucial to the success of Catholic schools, it is because that institution provides the functional community which can assist children, especially those with few social supports, with the assistance they need to receive a good education. They imply that other institutions or settings could provide similar benefits.

Further support for the transferability of findings from Catholic schools is found in recent research by Hill, Foster and Gendler (1990) in Catholic, special-purpose and zoned public high school in New York City. The authors found "more important similarities than differences among Catholic and special-purpose public schools, and we saw dramatic differences between both of these kinds of schools and zoned public schools." They combined the Catholic and the special-purpose high schools into a single category they called "focus" schools and remarked that they "have the characteristics of the site-managed schools suggested by educational reformers in the 1980s. In fact, urban parochial schools may be the most mature example of site-managed schools in existence." (p. vi). In short, the Catholic schools are not completely defined by their links to the Catholic Church and appear to offer much of value to the wider discussion of school reform.

III. MULTISCHOOL NETWORKS PART I: PARISH-BASED CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

In order to understand the potential contributions of Catholic schools to the reform debate, it is necessary to make a distinction between the two primary forms of Catholic school sponsorship in the United States: parish-based and religious-order sponsored. The 1990-91 report from the National Catholic Education Association revealed that 96% of the 7,292 Catholic elementary schools and 60% of the 1,296 Catholic high schools in the United States in 1990-91 were sponsored by single parishes, groups of parishes, or dioceses. The remainder were termed "private," meaning they were owned and sponsored by religious orders or, in some few cases, lay boards of director. This chapter will deal with the largest of these two types of Catholic schools

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and, in the process, will suggest possible lessons to be learned from their experience.

The parish Catholic elementary school is what probably jumps to mind most readily when the term "Catholic school" is used. In some of the larger American cities, notably in New England and the upper Mid West, there can be a Catholic elementary school every few blocks. Because most parishes were originally created along geographical lines, these schools tend to be neighborhood schools. Some parishes, especially in the older cities in the country, were established as ethnic parishes. Thus, in Chicago you might find a geographic parish with its school not blocks from a traditionally German parish, a Polish parish and an Italian parish, all with their own elementary schools. These schools were originally designed to serve children of that ethnic parish, but as time and demographics have changed the cities, most of these schools (and many of the parishes) have lost their ethnic connections.

Until 1970, many parishes sponsored a high school in addition to the elementary school. Most of these were quite small and, with increasing economic pressures, many closed or merged with other small high schools to form regional or diocesan schools. Many elementary schools also merged under pressure to form interparish or regional schools. Some of these are responsible to individual parishes or groups of parishes; others are responsible to the central administration of the diocese--the Chancery--although (as will be discussed below) these schools would almost all fit the definition of "site-based."

One of the most important elements the parish-based Catholic schools of today have in common is that they were almost always started and staffed by religious orders or men or women. From the early 1800s until the early 1960s, a common pattern prevailed for the creation and operation of these schools. A bishop, priest or even a group of laity would recognize the need for a Catholic school and would begin planning for the building of such a structure. The bishop would then approach a religious order (usually of women) and ask that they staff the school. In modern business terms we would say that the bishop would be offering a contract (informal as that might be) to the religious order to conduct a school within a given parish and diocese. Some bishops approached religious orders in Europe or Canada which could meet specific purposes identified by the bishop, such as the ability to teach in German or French, or the openness of the order to conduct hospitals as well as schools within the diocese. Many European religious orders opened training centers in the United States to fill the need for parish schools, and new religious orders sprang up in the United States in response to this same need.

Much of the growth in the numbers of schools occurred after what is known as the Council of Baltimore in 1884. At that Council, the American

bishops decreed that every parish should build a Catholic school and that all Catholic children should attend such schools. These goals were never met, but growth was substantial: in 1885 there were 2,464 elementary schools in Catholic parishes in the United States; by 1920 the number of parish schools had more than doubled, to 5,852. The number of sisters needed to staff these schools doubled as well.

When a religious order accepted an invitation (a contract) to manage a school, it would also be accepting much of the responsibility for founding, staffing, directing, conducting and evaluating the school. Religious orders trained their own teachers and "formed" them in the tradition of the particular order. They identified curricular materials for use in the schools and would often assist in the design of the school building and classrooms. They were almost solely responsible for the day-to-day operation of the schools. They handled everything from liaison with the bishop and the pastor to settling disputes between second graders on the school playground.

One of the great advantages of these religious order staffed schools is that there was a single source for all major components critical to the success of the school. The teachers were trained together, so that they shared a common set of assumptions and goals. Since they took vows of obedience to their superior in the order, they could be moved as needed throughout the network. Thus, a weak principal could be replaced, rapidly and quietly, with one who could deal with whatever crisis faced an individual school. Older sisters served as mentors for younger ones in both teaching and administration. As new needs arose, the order could react immediately. A particularly good example of this is found in the experience of an order of Irish sisters who had served several schools in Los Angeles since the mid-1930s. In 1965, the sisters assigned to one of the schools found that many of their students spoke only Spanish and that they were unable to teach them or communicate with their parents. The principal immediately contracted for Spanish lessons for all of the sisters each day after school and arranged for a cook and kitchen help (an unheard of luxury for these sisters) so they could concentrate all their efforts on becoming competent in Spanish. By the middle of the school year, these Irish-born sisters could all communicate with their Spanish-speaking students, and by year's end many were fluent. The flip side of this flexibility is that some of these sisters were needed more desperately the following year in another, non-Spanish speaking school.

Until 1960, the religious orders of men and women were just barely able to keep up with the growing demand for leadership in the schools and personnel to staff them. However, a combination of events occurred in the 1950s and 1960s which led to a dramatic decrease in the number of sisters, brothers and priests available to staff the schools. There has not yet been a comprehensive study of what actually occurred during those years, but the outcome was that religious orders began to re-evaluate their "charisms"

(what might be called their corporate goals) and many decided that education might not be the only, or even the best, way to serve others. Some religious orders consciously decided to withdraw from staffing parish schools; others withdrew as the result of gradual attrition. The result was that many parishes were suddenly confronted by the fact that the personnel and support services which had kept the schools going were no longer available. Where sisters and brothers had worked for very low salaries, lay teachers now had to be hired at a living wage. Where all personnel and curriculum decisions used to be made by the educational specialist in the order, now individual schools or pastors had to make these decisions. The cost of the Catholic schools rose dramatically. And, at the same time, there were those inside and outside the church who were questioning the need to maintain costly private schools in light of the perceived neutrality of the public schools regarding religion. Bishops, priests and lay people began questioning the reasons for supporting Catholic schools.

The story of these years is both painful and intriguing. Many of the schools that were unable to pay for teachers, or repair old buildings, or provide adequate books or materials, had to close their doors. Others limped along, attempting to meet the needs of a decreasing pool of students caused by the end of the "baby boom" and the movement of Catholics from the inner cities (where there were school buildings) to the suburbs (where there were not). The intriguing part of the equation is that the schools which survived did so by adapting to their environment, responding to their market. Again, this is a long and complex story with many revealing episodes and events. It cannot be told here. But the upheavals and stresses and traumas of that period were common to most religious orders, parishes and schools.

With the formal withdrawal of many religious orders from parish-sponsored schools, those schools which survived looked to their dioceses for some support services. At the time, some school officials felt that the Catholic schools should adopt the public school model, where a majority of decisions about buildings, curriculum, teacher qualifications, employment and salaries, and benefits should all be centralized in a diocesan schools office. (McCluskey, 1969). However, few if any of the more than 110 dioceses in the country at the time adopted this model, and a majority of the responsibility for the operation of individual schools shifted from the religious orders to the individual schools. Schools which had originally been a part of a network now became even more closely reliant on their communities and sponsoring parishes for support. In many cases (but not all) the network was gone, but the schools had an infrastructure and a support system which permitted them to continue. The story of how this occurred could be instructive for public school reformers wondering if site-based schools are possible, but that story will have to be told elsewhere. Instead, we will turn to the multischool networks which survived these changing times and which can provide

examples of ways in which public school networks might be able to develop and operate.

IV. MULTISCHOOL NETWORKS PART II: RELIGIOUS ORDER-SPONSORED SCHOOLS

The multischool networks created and still operated by religious orders share much of the history and many of the problems of parish and diocesan based schools described in the previous section. They are particularly important to the purpose of this paper, however, because they appear to have the most to offer the current discussion of alternatives for organizing groups of publicly supported schools. Also, in every case, the religious order networks described here have recently faced the possibility that their schools would not survive the cumulative financial and demographic problems that faced them. They have thus been forced to clarify what may before have been commonly held but scarcely articulated or procedures. They have had to identify what was important and what was not; they have had to decide what could be given up and what had to be saved. In short, they have had to decide what a network was and how to maintain it. Their experience in creating networks of schools, in supporting them over time, and in helping them adapt to change could be of significant value to others in the same situation.

This report focuses on just a handful of the more than 250 religious orders of men and women who operate, and often own, Catholic schools in the United States. These five orders were chosen for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the fact that they all have some written documentation on their "systems" or networks. They are also national orders which have schools in all parts of the country, schools which have existed for at least a century. And they have all been successful in surviving the stresses of the past three decades. These orders include two orders of women religious (the Religious of the Sacred Heart and the Society of the Holy Child Jesus); two orders of brothers (the Irish Christian Brothers and the Lasallian Christian Brothers); and one order of priests (the Society of Jesus, better known as the Jesuits). In the discussions below, examples will be drawn from the experiences of these orders to illustrate each of the principles which appear to favor the creation and maintenance of a successful school network. In addition, data on religious order school networks was also found in some studies which focused on other questions. These data will also be discussed where relevant.

What each of the religious orders has done with its schools is not necessarily original, and some orders have clearly emphasized one aspect of organizational development over the others in their approach. What is important here is the way they have brought two or more elements together to address critical challenges to the networks. Using the current educational

jargon, it could be said that the founder of each of these orders designed an effective school and was then able to replicate it. The followers of the founder were then able to expand the system, adapt to major changes in communities and environments, and then maintain quality control throughout a network of schools which were often at great geographic distances from each other. These were and are not easy tasks, either at the time of the founding when travel was by train and boat and timely communication was nonexistent, or today, when there are many conflicting calls on the order and many educational options in the marketplace. What these and other religious order networks have accomplished is impressive, and could be instructive, to others facing the challenges of individual schools and networks of schools.

Recent schools research has identified a set of characteristics of effective schools which are markedly similar across authors and settings and purposes. (For example, see Camarena, 1986, p. 69; Bryk, et al, 1984, p. 3; Deal and Peterson, 1990, p. 9; Mutschler, 1985, p. 124; Chubb and Moe, 1990, p. 186; Hill, et al, 1990, p. vii). These characteristics of effective individual schools are, not surprisingly, found to be at the heart of the multischool networks sponsored by the religious orders. Six elements appeared to be particularly significant in the history and development of the networks. They are listed below, and each is discussed in detail in the next sections of this report.

#1: The network and the schools which are a part of it have a clear vision of their purpose, their "mission." This vision/mission is supported by and articulated through common stories, heroes and celebrations and permeates all aspects of the institution.

#2: The leader of the individual school is fully formed (indoctrinated) into the central vision of the schools/network.

#3: Teachers and other staff form a community; they have become a "faculty."

#4: There is a governance system appropriate to the ownership or control of the school.

#5: Some central services are provided consistent with the overall vision/mission of the school, but decisions are made at the lowest appropriate level.

#6: There is an accountability system appropriate to an essentially site-managed system.

PURPOSE AND APPROACH

The network and the schools which are a part of it have a clear vision of their purpose, their "mission." This vision/mission is supported by and articulated through common stories, heroes and celebrations and permeates all aspects of the institution.

The importance of a clear "mission" to the effectiveness of an individual school is generally accepted in the literature (Deal and Peterson, 1991; Hill, Foster and Gendler, 1991). But how this mission is developed and how it functions within the network is not usually addressed. In most studies of organizations other than schools, ideology or purpose is seen as just one among many pulls on the organization. But sometimes the ideology or mission helps focus or balance the organization, and it is in this way that mission appears to function within the religious order school networks. A number of examples from these networks will illustrate this point.

The Jesuits (the Society of Jesus), founded in 1540 in Spain by Ignatius Loyola, is one of the largest and best known religious orders in the United States. The Jesuits have operated secondary schools and colleges throughout the world for 400 years and in the United States since the founding of Georgetown Preparatory School in Washington, D.C., in 1789. The hallmark of Jesuit education for much of this period was an emphasis on the classics, articulated in some detail in the Ratio Studiorum originally written by Ignatius Loyola in the 1590s. Until the 1970s, the 46 Jesuit secondary schools in the U.S. were open only to males. It was in the 1970s that the order experienced the decline in personnel and the general turmoil in education which forced it to face a rising tide of questions about the function and value of the secondary schools. The late 1960s in the Jesuit schools were tumultuous, just as they were in many public and Catholic schools and colleges through the country. The reasons for the upheavals are many but the result was a pervasive sense of crisis. Some Jesuits, however, did not blame the world outside for the anxiety within. One Jesuit educator wrote at the time that "The misapprehensions to be dispelled concern our present anxieties over declining Jesuit manpower and rising financial costs. I will maintain that these are not the real causes of the crisis we feel; the real cause is an ambiguity over our goals." (Starratt, 1971, p. 1)

Faced with a crisis in the secondary schools, a group of Jesuits gathered in 1970 at Georgetown Prep to prepare a constitution for a new association of Jesuit secondary schools. The Jesuit Educational Association, founded in 1934, had previously served both the secondary schools and the colleges. When this parent organization decided that there should be separate associations for the two types of schools, the planning for a Jesuit Secondary Education Association began. The group of Jesuits who met to form the organization began their writing of a new constitution by preparing a

Preamble which became, in retrospect, a "psychological turning point" for the Jesuit schools. (Starratt, 1971, pp14-15) The Jesuits confronted a challenge and a decision which, for many, boiled down to the question of whether the Jesuit secondary schools were worth saving, whether the order was wiling to make the changes necessary to keep them going. These were not empty or rhetorical questions. Other religious orders were meeting at the same time, facing the same problems, and deciding that the schools were not longer a viable option for the order. These orders could see no way that the schools could survive the loss of religious order leadership and manpower. Thus, there were plenty of precedents available for closing secondary or elementary schools. It is noteworthy, therefore, that the Jesuits decided to continue.

The Jesuits gathered at Georgetown Prep opted to clearly reaffirm the value of sponsoring secondary schools. In the words of the Preamble, "Without attempting to deny the many serious problems Jesuit schools are facing, we nevertheless feel impelled to assert that these schools can face a bold and challenging future if they will be true to their particularly Jesuit heritage: that is, if they can sharpen and activate the vision of Ignatius which has sustained them for four centuries." (Item 4, Preamble). The sharpening of the vision began almost immediately, with Jesuit schools across the country using the Preamble as a starting point for intensive discussion of the whys and hows of Jesuit education. In 1972 the JSEA Commission on Research and Development (CORD), produced a booklet called The Jesuit High School of the Future. According to its authors, the need for reformulation of the educational vision was apparent because "In the past decade, the unity of the Jesuit high school curriculum, formerly focused upon the classics, has disintegrated." (JSEA, 1972, p. 3)

Various schools were making changes in all aspects of school operation, but there was concern that these changes were being made "without a study of the implications of these choices for the values they are pursuing." (Ibid., p. 3) The document was intended to emphasize what is most Ignatian in the vision of the schools and to provide guidelines for development. Following the development of this school-wide vision, CORD in 1981 published a Profile of the Graduate of a Jesuit High School at Graduation. In essence, the educators were saying that articulation of the vision was not enough; what was needed was a way to apply this vision to the "product" desired, the graduate of the network of schools. This profile of the ideal graduate presented 63 behavioral objectives divided into five categories. The authors wrote that "...in so far as the school can intentionally bring its resources to bear on fostering students' growth in the direction of the profile, it should do so." (JSEA, 1981, p. 1). The five categories (with attached explication) include:

"I. Open to Growth. The Jesuit high school student at the time of graduation has matured as a person - emotionally, intellectually, physically,

socially, religiously - to a level that reflects some intentional responsibility for one's own growth (as opposed to a passive, drifting, laissez-faire attitude about growth). The graduate is at least beginning to reach out in his or her development, seeking opportunities to stretch one's mind, imagination, feelings, and religious consciousness.

II. Intellectually Competent. By graduation, the Jesuit high school student will exhibit a mastery of those academic requirements for advanced forms of education. While these requirements are broken down into departmental subject matter areas, the student will have developed many intellectual skills and understandings which cut across and go beyond academic requirements for college entrance. The student moreover is beginning to see the need for intellectual integrity in his or her personal quest for religious truth and in his or her response to issues of social justice.

III. Religious. By graduation the Jesuit high school student will have a basic knowledge of the major doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church. The graduate will also have examined his or her own religious feelings and beliefs with a view to choosing a fundamental orientation toward God and establishing a relationship with a religious tradition or community. What is said here, respectful of the conscience and religious background of the individual, also applies to the non-Catholic graduate of a Jesuit high school. The level of theological understanding of the Jesuit high school graduate will naturally be limited by the student's level of religious and human development.

IV. Loving. By the time of graduation, the Jesuit high school student is well on the way to establishing his or her own identity. The graduate is also on the threshold of being able to move beyond self-interest or self-centeredness in relationships with significant others. In other words he or she is beginning to be able to risk some deeper levels of relationship in which one can disclose self and accept the mystery of another person and cherish that person. Nonetheless, the graduate's attempts at loving, while clearly beyond childhood, may not yet reflect the confidence and freedom of a mature person.

V. Committed to Doing Justice. The Jesuit high school student at graduation has achieved considerable knowledge of the many needs of local and wider communities and is preparing for the day when he or she will take a place in these communities as a competent, concerned and responsible member. The graduate has begun to acquire the skills and motivation necessary to live as a person for others. Although this attribute will come to fruition in mature adulthood, some predispositions will have begun to manifest themselves earlier.

The Society of the Sacred Heart is an order of women religious founded in France in 1800 by Madaleine Sophie Barat. Her plan on how to organize schools for young women and how to teach was presented as a Plan of Studies in 1805 and was heavily influenced by the Jesuit Ratio Studiorum. The Plan was modified frequently in subsequent decades, but had become static by the mid-1900s. Like the rest of Catholic education in the 1960s and '70s, the Sacred heart schools faced upheaval and change. Up to that time, one of the hallmarks of a Sacred Heart education in any part of the world had been the consistency and uniformity of the curriculum and the teaching methodology. It was possible to predict what any class in any Sacred Heart school anyplace in the world was doing on any given day. This changed, and changed rapidly, in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Experimentation became the new hallmark. One historian of the order wrote that "During the upheaval and changes of 1968-72, it was difficult for insiders or outsiders to identify the Society's role and mission. The Society was in a state of flux not unlike the rest of American society." (McCarthy, 1990, p. 99).

The rising tide of change, both within and outside the Sacred Heart schools, took its toll and eleven Sacred Heart schools closed in the mid-1970s. This was almost one-third of the total number of Sacred Heart schools then in existence in the United States. These decisions to close schools were made independently by the five American Provinces (geographic divisions) of the order. The shock waves caused by the closings among students, families, alumnae and the religious order itself were such that the provincials decided to act in concert in the future, making major decisions together. In other words, they realized that their decisions may have been made in haste and without considering alternatives to closing. Learning from this experience, they began to rethink their mission and their supporting structures. This was the probable moment of birth of a conscious network of Sacred Heart schools which went beyond the religious order itself.

The work of refocusing the mission of the Sacred Heart Schools began almost before the dust settled from the closing of the schools. In 1973, a national conference of Sacred Heart educators was galvanized by a moving address about the Society's identity crisis and "what it means to be a Sacred Heart educator." This address was given by Sister Kit Collins, who had recently been named Coordinator of Sacred Heart Schools. This address identified a key tension between maintaining the distinctive qualities of Sacred Heart schools and recognizing the autonomy of individual schools. The resolution of this tension began with the adoption, in 1975, of the Goals and Criteria for Sacred Heart Schools. According to this document, the Goals and Criteria "are sine qua non for every school that belongs to the Sacred Heart network. They provide the framework within which each school is to develop specific objectives appropriate to its local situation." (McCarthy, p. 112)

Goal 1: Schools of the Sacred Heart commit themselves to educate to a personal and active faith in God.

Example: 3. The school provides education in, and opportunities for, decision making in the light of Gospel values.

Goal 2: Schools of the Sacred Heart commit themselves to educate to a deep respect for intellectual values.

Example: 3. The curriculum prepares students to live cooperatively in a global and technological society.

Goal 3: Schools of the Sacred Heart commit themselves to educate to a social awareness which impels to action.

Example: 5. The school has programs which enable each member of the school community to be engaged in effective action for social change.

Goal 4: Schools of the Sacred Heart commit themselves to educate to the building of community as a Christian value.

Examples: 1. The adults model and teach skills needed to build community, and provide opportunities to exercise these skills. 4. The financial aid program effectively supports socioeconomic diversity.

Goal 5: Schools of the Sacred Heart commit themselves to educate to personal growth in an atmosphere of wise freedom.

Example: 4. School policies and practice promote self-discipline, responsibility, and decision making.

According to McCarthy, the Goals and Criteria did what they were intended to do; they "helped lay to rest the unrest of the previous decade. . . [they] provided the Schools with a much needed focus. It provided closure--an anchor--to the years of driftlessness, unrest and uncertainty." (McCarthy, p. 120) The Goals and Criteria were posted in every school; they became part of the daily vocabulary of the schools; they were the touchstone against which proposals for change were to be measured. The Goals also provided the foundation for one of the most valuable contributions of the Sacred Heart order to the development of cohesive school networks: an evaluation or accountability system designed to continually review and renew schools in light of the Goals and Criteria. This accountability system is described and discussed in a later section of this report.

The Irish Christian Brothers, an order of religious brothers rather than priests, was founded in Ireland in 1806 by Edmund Rice. His specific aim was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to provide an education for impoverished Irish boys. The first school in the United States sponsored by the Irish Christian Brothers was opened in 1906. Before the 1980s, the Christian Brothers staffed a number of diocesan high schools (those owned by a diocese) as well as several schools which they owned themselves. They are now in the process of phasing out of the sites they do not themselves own, while struggling to maintain their remaining institutions in the United States. They also own and operate schools in many other countries throughout the world.

The Irish Christian Brothers, unlike the Jesuits or the Religious or the Sacred Heart, have largely an oral tradition. That is, they have not followed a written plan of studies, but have developed their distinctive approach to education through the training of their personnel in the past and, now, through the more conscious articulation of the vision of the Christian Brothers. This necessary articulation of the largely unwritten tradition of the order has ironically brought some problems to light while revitalizing the sense of purpose of the schools. The problem has been that the brothers' schools were originally founded to educate the poorest of the poor in Ireland. The schools which were opened in the United States also aimed at the education of those most in need of education and, originally, these were often the Irish youth of the big Eastern cities.

As the Irish, and Catholics in general, climbed up the socioeconomic ladder, the Christian Brothers schools began to attract a more affluent clientele. At the same time, the increasing scarcity of brothers caused the cost of running the schools to rise. Thus, a clarification of the original focus of the schools brought into clearer light the great difficulty of retaining the mission of the schools and still keeping the doors open. According to the Director of Education of the Western Province of the Christian Brothers, one of the precipitating factors in developing relationships among Christian Brothers schools and strengthening their internal governance systems is the fact that the original purpose of the schools might get lost in the demographic changes among the original target group for the Brothers' schools. (Conversation with Brother Al Dogan, Director of Education for the Western Province of the Irish Christian Brothers, April 1992.)

One of the major focuses for the Christian Brothers, as they face the future, has been to develop ways to more consciously proclaim the mission of their schools. One product of this effort is a document known as "The Call to Mission, the Call to Governance." Another method for doing this is through what are known as "Called and Gifted" workshops. These two-day meetings/retreats are intended to bring the Christian Brothers tradition to life. These workshops are attended by two or three faculty members from each of the Christian Brothers schools. These attenders are then expected to go back to their schools and act as a core for the renewal of the vision for the school. Thus, the order is in effect "seeding" the schools with teachers who

have come in contact with the still largely oral tradition of the order and who have had an intensive experience of that tradition. It is interesting to note here that the Jesuits and the Religious of the Sacred Heart were both orders founded on clear documentation and highly articulated relationships; they thus responded to their individual identity crises with the development of clearer and more relevant documents and guidelines. The Irish Christian Brothers, rooted as they are in an oral tradition, have produced few new documents but have continued the tradition of the personal "catching" of the tradition through experience.

Deal and Peterson, in their 1990 study of the principal's role in shaping school culture, maintain that the principal must articulate shared values, celebrate school heroes and heroines, observe rituals, and observe ceremonies. These aspects of a culture have long been at the heart of most Catholic schools. From one point of view, this could even be seen as one of the easier tasks faced by the religious order schools since they have such a rich, and often colorful, history to build upon. The Religious of the Sacred Heart distribute a small booklet to all new teachers and students giving some of the key ceremonies and traditions of the network of schools, some dating back almost two hundred years. One particularly effective tradition comes from Madeleine Sophie Barat, the founder, who insisted that life at the Sacred Hearts schools should resemble an extended family. The nuns were called "Mother;" students were called "children of the Sacred Heart" and older girls were expected to help younger ones. "Family" became a core image and unifying factor through decades of growth and change.

There is also an emphasis throughout many of the order schools on the value of being part of a national and, in many cases, international network of schools. Graduates of Sacred Hearts schools are found in almost every country on the globe, often within the highest levels of government. Tales of the "old girls" network of Sacred Heart graduates are legion, and can be echoed in the experiences of graduates of other networks of religious order schools. Alums of Jesuit schools have had similar experiences, and these links are stressed for students and faculty alike in the schools today. Most orders permit, and even encourage, student exchanges among the schools in the national and international networks. Thus, a Japanese student from a Sacred Heart School in Tokyo might change places with a student from Villa Duchesne in St. Louis, while a student from the Jesuit preparatory school in Paraguay might switch for a semester with a student at Gonzaga Prep in Spokane, WA. These students share a tradition which transcends national boundaries. There is a pride in being a student at one of the schools because the heroes and heroines among the founders and the graduates are frequently discussed and celebrated. Beyond strengthening the bonds among students within a school, these aspects of school culture also build on, and take strength from, bonds with the larger community outside the school. The "social capital" this can potentially create (See Coleman and Hoffer, 1987) can

be of special importance to the growth, or the very survival, of a school or a system.

FORMATION OF SCHOOL LEADERS

The leader of the individual school is fully formed (indoctrinated) into the central vision of the school/network.

The importance of the educational leader to the success of an individual school is heavily emphasized in the effective schools research. Without an effective principal, it is difficult if not impossible for a school to achieve its goals. How do principals in the religious order school networks function? How do they relate to the network or to whatever central office exists? As noted earlier, the research on Catholic schools indicates that Catholic school principals tend to have responsibilities and authority analogous to that of the superintendent in the public school system. (Bryk, Holland, Lee and Carriedo, 1984) How do the religious orders identify, prepare, and support these principals who are, in effect, at the strategic apex of their institutions?

Prior to the mid-1960s, the task of developing educational leaders for religious order schools was considerably easier than it is now. The religious orders maintained their own training programs lasting anywhere from four to thirteen years. During this time of formation, the applicant to the order would learn about the philosophy, traditions, and mission of the order. At the same time, he or she would be preparing for teaching, nursing, administration or other tasks. When a principal (or community superior or other local leader) was assigned to an institution, it was with the assumption that this leader would be able to fully represent the interests of the order and act from its foundational principles. An analogy could be made to the preparation and assignment of colonial governors by the Roman Empire or, more recently, by the British Empire. Not all leaders were exemplary, but their training prepared them to carry out the agenda of the empire with little, if any, direct supervision.

With the loss of many women and men religious over the last 25 years, and the dearth of new applicants to the orders, the religious orders have had to develop new ways to assure the continuation of their vision through the leadership of their institutions. In most of the orders mentioned, there has been a clear policy of keeping a member of the order in a key leadership role in the school. For the time being, all heads of schools in the Sacred Heart network are members of the order. All presidents of Jesuit secondary schools are Jesuits, although there are now a number of lay principals. The Irish Christian Brothers are now considering lay principals in some of their schools, and the Society of the Holy Child now has few of its own sisters

heading its schools. As time goes on, this latter situation will become more common. But it does not decrease the emphasis within these orders on finding ways to "form" the principal or other leader.

The fact that formation continues to play an important role in maintaining the vision and character of the schools is found in a recent study of internal governance structures of selected Catholic high schools. (Hocevar, 1989) Some of the schools this author studied were either owned or governed by religious orders; others were diocesan or regional schools. The author found that "in the day to day operation of the high schools, the administrative style of the religious community or the individual principal determines the decision-making process . . . School community members [in a high school administered by a religious order] agreed that the religious who have administrative positions were interchangeable parts." (Hocevar, p. 138) Clearly, this unidentified order had produced leaders who acted consistently, and evidently uniformly, within the principles of the sponsoring order. Whether this "interchangeability" is desirable is not the question here; the fact of the order's success simply emphasizes what makes this particular network work well without a strong central control mechanism. The leaders are well-trained in the principles of the order and then given the freedom to use their knowledge in the school to which they are assigned.

A more specific example of the role of the common formation experience on the operation of network schools is found among the members of the Jesuit order. At the very heart of the Jesuit mission or vision are the "Spiritual Exercises" written by Ignatius Loyola. This series of directions for reading and reflection and action are usually experienced as a 30-day retreat organized into four "weeks," each with a particular focus. A Jesuit brother or priest will typically complete a 30-day Ignatian retreat at least twice during his preparation for profession or ordination. Pedro Arrupe, head of the Jesuit order during the critical years of crisis in the 1960s and 1970s, saw the Exercises as key to the formation of leaders for the schools. He wrote in 1972 that "hopefully, too, this renewal will bring you - and all of us - to a common language, an accepted list of apostolic priorities, and a felt identity springing from the Spiritual Exercises." (Arrupe, Letter, p. 2) Because a 30-day retreat is impractical for most lay people, there is a variant (originally suggested by Ignatius himself) called the Spiritual Exercises in Daily life. This is a program which takes the four "weeks" and spreads them over a full year of study and direction. Briefer versions of the Spiritual Exercises have also been developed over time to be used by students, faculty and administrators who are not Jesuits.

To put these visions more immediately into practice, to form teachers in the basic principles and values of Ignatius and the Jesuits, the JSEA (specifically, the Commission on Research and Development) designed workshops for administrators on team dynamics, curriculum development,

long-range planning, staff development and supervision, all designed to assist school leaders to do their jobs better in light of Jesuit principles. All Jesuit secondary schools presently have presidents who are Jesuits, but there are now a number of lay men and women serving as emphasis on what is known as "Companions," non-Jesuit educators, and inclusion of them in deliberations on the future of the Jesuit schools.

The Coordinator of Sacred Heart Schools, Sister Susan Maxwell, recalls an early visit to one of the Sacred Hearts schools when she realized very clearly the educational task before her. A lay trustee, who had been very active and productive at the school, confided in Sister Maxwell that she was delighted with lay involvement in the governance of the school, but that she was also happily confident that there would always be Sacred Heart religious available to provide direction to the schools. Soon thereafter, one of the Sacred Heart sisters teaching at the school confided her own relief to Sister Maxwell that lay men and women were being prepared to take over and continue the mission of the Sacred Heart schools so that the existence of the school would not be dependent on the presence of Sacred Heart sisters. From this and other experiences came specific programs to train leaders and trustees in the mission of the Sacred Heart schools. In 1990, a Leadership Development Program was begun, designed to develop Heads of Schools. Open to both religious and lay, men and women, the first class included two women religious and one lay man, all seeking a possible position as head of a Sacred Heart institution. Although completion of the course will not guarantee a job to the applicant, nor will the course be required of future heads, the Network Executive Committee members "feel that another vehicle needed to be in place to insure that future heads fully understood the value and ethos of the Sacred Heart educator." (McCarthy, p. 189).

The Network of Sacred Heart Schools also provides training programs or conferences for a variety of professionals who work in the Sacred Heart schools. Included among these offerings are conferences for school business managers, elementary curriculum specialists, alumnae directors, heads of elementary and secondary schools, athletic directors, college counselors, science teachers, admissions directors, boarding school personnel, development directors, computer teachers, upper school curriculum directors and others. (McCarthy, p. 216) Another innovation in the mid-1980s was the New Faculty Workshop designed for teachers who have taught two years or less in a Sacred Heart school. The workshops are held regularly and the sites change yearly. The purpose of the workshop is "to convey the 'specialness' of teaching in a Sacred Heart school--and to connect to its rich history and tradition." (McCarthy, p. 217)

Like the "Called and Gifted" workshops developed by the Irish Christian Brothers and discussed above, these programs act to "seed" the schools with teachers and administrators who are committed to the vision of

a particular network of schools. However, the programs offered by the Religious of the Sacred Heart attempt to reach many more types of personnel than those offered by the Christian Brothers, all in the effort to strengthen both the vision of the school and the leadership ability of those who serve in them.

CREATION OF COMMUNITY WITHIN AND AMONG SCHOOLS

Teachers and other staff must form a community; they must become a "faculty."

According to many educational theorists and practitioners (see especially Sizer, 1985) the real work of education takes place in the triad made up of the teacher, the student, and the material to be learned. This is the bottom line. In some typologies of organization (see Mintzberg, 1979), this key element is known as the operating core, the place where the work of the organization is really done. In the schools, this operating core is made up of the teachers. One comprehensive review of educational reform efforts over the past several decades (Elmore and McLaughlin, 1988) found that most previous reform efforts have not touched this core, have, in fact, tended to either ignore or alienate it. Murphy (1992) identified teacher empowerment as one of the critical necessities in restructuring America's schools. He wrote that "the goal is to move away from treating teachers as hired hands or assembly line workers to a situation in which change is teacher driven, not authority driven." (p. 11) Hill, Foster and Gendler (1990) found that high schools with character had faculties who not only understood the mission of the school, but also formed a "faculty." This would appear to be one key to living out the mission of the school.

In the past, the religious orders controlled all aspects of the operating core. Mintzberg (1979), writing from a base of research into hundreds of different organizations, contends that one of the only effective ways of assuring quality control in a professional organization (such as a school) is through the training and "indoctrination" of the operating core (as opposed to direct supervision or standardization of work process or product). In the years before 1965, the religious order schools were staffed almost entirely by members of the religious orders. Future faculty members received both their professional training and their formation (indoctrination) through the order. Then the members of the order, like the Roman centurions, could be sent far afield with a confidence that they understood and could live out the mission of the organization. In most cases members of a faculty lived together and shared all aspects of their professional and personal lives. They were, almost by definition, a community. But with the loss of this pool of personnel and later of the personnel system itself, the orders had to turn to other ways of

incorporating teachers into the community, of forming an operating core into a faculty.

Most of the orders covered in this study have designed a number of events each year whose primary purpose is to bring together the members of an individual school's faculty and staff, or faculty/staff from different schools, around the mission of the school and their own role in it. Some schools use mentors who are experienced in the school in help new teachers in the school or the network; others hold retreats and other inservice events to orient new teachers to the school. This goes back again, of course, to the clarity of mission of the school and the sponsoring order. The very existence of a clear, articulated mission statement can make this kind of orientation possible. Hocevar (1989), in her study of internal governance structures of Catholic high schools, found that the amount of responsibility placed on individual teachers "within the framework of the school mission and philosophy" to make decisions about textbooks, methodology, discipline and student activities, actively functioned to bring the teachers together rather than separate them. From her observations, she concluded that "the mutuality among school community members and the web of information that is shared results in people working together to make the high school successful. There are feelings that 'this building is mine. I have stock in it.'" (Hocevar, p. 141).

Among Jesuits, the issue of personnel and community was an important one from the very first. One of the first act of the newly formed JSEA was to emphasize the importance of the faculty to the success of the educational enterprise. Much as the authors of the "Preamble" to the JSEA constitution made the case that the loss of Jesuit personnel was not the primary cause for the crisis in the Jesuit schools in the late 1960s, it was clear that the loss of a predominantly Jesuit faculty did pose serious questions about the desired consistency of vision in the school. To deal with this challenge, the Preamble sent forth a clear call. "If the faculty at a Jesuit school are men and women whose lives are inspired by the Ignatian vision, then the question about the number of Jesuits in the faculty is not an overriding issue. It is more a question of the quality of the lives of all the faculty, both Jesuit and lay. The school will be Jesuit if the lives of its teachers exemplify and communicate to the students the vision of Ignatius." (JSEA Preamble, Item 7)

One of the most significant developments in this area was the creation by JSEA in 1981 of a special workshop-retreat experience called the Colloquium on the Ministry of Teaching. This experience for teachers was designed to lead teachers to an awareness of the apostolic character of their profession. This Colloquium eventually spread to 38 countries around the world and is considered by many to be one of the most successful products of the JSEA. It provides what Pedro Arrupe termed the "common language, an

accepted list apostolic priorities, and a felt identity" among the faculty of a Jesuit school.

As indicated earlier, both the Irish Christian Brothers and the Religious of the Sacred Heart have also developed approaches to forming both school leaders and faculty. This formation goal is met through both the process used (bringing the leaders and faculty together from a number of different schools in one place for a significant period of time) and the content being addressed (sometimes "vision" materials; sometimes models or methods specific to a particular group of teachers or leaders.) There is an emphasis on both the immediate school community and the larger network community.

Another of the religious orders, the Brothers of the Christian Schools, has also been active in forming school personnel into a community, a faculty. This order, founded by St. John de la Salle in France in 1681, is better known in this country as the Lasallian Christian Brothers. Like many of the other orders, the Lasallians have a history which is full of colorful leaders and heroic deeds. John de la Salle was a French aristocrat who decided to educate young street boys and gathered a group of young men to help him. He called his group "Christian Gentlemen," but he envisioned these gentlemen as "big brothers" to their students. Thus, they came to be known as brothers. De la Salle is given credit for a number of innovations in education: teaching in the vernacular rather than in the Latin common at that time; teaching the working class; and teaching classes of students rather than tutoring individuals. De la Salle wrote a book of rules, called The Conduct of Schools, which is literally a step-by-step handbook for his teachers and remains the foundation for much of what the Lasallians claim as their primary charism or focus.

There are now eight provinces in the United States within what is called the Christian Brothers Conference, and over 106 "establishments," including 67 high schools. Most are not owned by the order, but are considered by the order (and by the students, parents and alums) as Lasallian institutions in fact if not in law. The Secretary of Education for the Conference sees his task as the "Lasallianization" of the work of the schools within the network. A key element in this Lasallianization is the concept that the schools and all associated with them -- boards, principals, teachers, students, alums -- are part of the Lasallian family. Thus, all are invited and encouraged to become a part of understanding the history and traditions of the order and to carry on this tradition. A document entitled "Characteristics of a Lasallian School" is now in development and will undergird this effort. As with all other orders discussed here, the Lasallians know that if they wish their vision to continue beyond the death of the last brother, then the order must bring boards and administrators and faculty into the Lasallian family. (Conversation with Brother Robert McCann,F.S.C., April, 1992).

Besides echoing many of the themes seen in the other orders, the Lasallian Christian Brothers have also contributed a case study on building a faculty. The principal of one of the Lasallian high schools on the east coast presented this study to a national convention in 1992. He drew on educational management theory to prepare a focused look at what the Lasallians see as the central theme of their order's mission: "together and by association," with association defined as "The sharing of vision, sharing of values, sharing of experiences, sharing of decision-making, and sharing of leadership which promotes the accomplishment of mission in an effective way." (Mueller, 1992) The author then provides concrete examples of how his school had developed into a community within the Lasallian vision. He recounts that, over a two year period, the faculty of his school developed a consensus document, a consensus vision, that started with a projection of expectations for graduates within the context of the world they will encounter as adults. These expectations were then grouped, refined, discussed and expanded by parents and students through working committees. After discussion, reflection and multiple drafts, a final mission statement was unanimously accepted by the Faculty Senate. According to Brother Mueller, "Much more important than the document itself was the process of sharing and dialogue out of which a common vision did emerge. . . Our school's mission statement is the foundation for hiring, for curriculum development, for long-range educational planning, for discipline policy, for our athletic department's goals, and for school life in general. It is a living and lived document, a shared and common vision of what we hope to accomplish together." (Mueller, p. 5.)

The author provides many more examples of how he and his faculty worked to develop a specific school culture and vision within the umbrella vision of the Lasallian tradition. He writes of the formal and informal ways in which new teachers are invited to become a part of the total enterprise. "I have organized an on-going seminar for teachers new to the school in which various members of the faculty, our school's present heroes so to speak, share their insights into and ideas about teaching with the newer members of the staff. Such sessions, which decrease in frequency over the year, not only provide these men and women with practical suggestions but also expose them to faculty members who embody and can articulate the school vision. Coming to commitment is more often a process of osmosis than a process of conscious choice. It is like falling in love; it happens before we know what happened." (Mueller, p. 6)

Other examples of working "together and in association" include ways to address the sense of isolation which is so often noted among teachers within a school. Mueller writes, from experience, that "inservice workshops or staff development initiatives which are imposed from above just do not work. Rather, teachers must be allowed to develop their own opportunities and administrators must recognize that differentiated staff development is

more appropriate than putting all faculty through one conveyer belt experience. . . . the administration of the school must assume a consultant and coordinating position." (Mueller, p. 10) Brother Mueller's address provides examples of faculty events which have worked to help them form a sense of community, along with many other concrete suggestions for building leadership and a sense of ownership throughout the school. But what is noteworthy about this document, in addition to its specificity and grounding in contemporary educational theory and practice, is that it sees the school as gaining strength from, and contributing strength back to, the Lasallian network of schools. The school does not stand alone, just as the individual teacher does not stand alone. There is strength, rather than redtape, in these kinds of connections.

GOVERNANCE FOR SITE BASED MANAGEMENT

There is a governance system appropriate to the circumstances of the control and ownership of the school.

At a time when the issue of local and district school boards and their future is one of great interest and controversy (see Danzberger, Kirst and Usdan, 1992), the history of the religious order transition to local boards within a common network can be instructive. The religious order schools have, in less than two decades, had to make revolutionary changes in their methods of governance. The changes were not made at leisure or in an atmosphere of stability and optimism. Rather, they were made under conditions of extreme stress with the very survival of the schools at stake. What the religious orders came to realize over this period of time is echoed by Danzberger, Kirst and Usdan in their recent volume on public school governance:

Governance is not a neutral variable in the education reform equation. We believe that the governance function is so central to achieving a vastly improved education system in this nation that reform of governance must be addressed directly. Reform of governance may be the most difficult political task in education reform but the nation cannot construct a new public school system without transforming the institution of local school governance. (Danzberger, Kirst and Usdan, 1992, p. 98).

The religious orders did just that: they transformed the institutions of local school governance within their networks.

From the building of the first religious order schools in the United States in the 18th century until the mid-1960s, the governance of the religious order owned schools was fairly simple: the religious order owned the buildings and lands which made up the school campus and, through

religious order boards or conferences set overall goals for the schools and principles of operation in greater or lesser detail, depending on the history of the order. Control was achieved through provision of most or all of the administrative and operational staff in the schools. Where individual school boards existed, they were made up of members of the religious order or were coterminous with the religious order provincial council. The 1970s and 1980s saw a gradual change of governance and control within the religious order schools. Many of the orders which chose to retain their connection to their schools chose to assist the schools in developing advisory or governing boards which would provide direction to individual schools.

The major association of independent private schools in the United States, the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS), has long recognized the importance of Boards of Trustees to the health and the very existence of independent schools. Their publication on governing boards, now in its sixth edition, states the matter clearly: "The board of an independent school has the ultimate responsibility for the institution. School heads and trustees come and go; only the board is permanent. The board is responsible for the integrity of the school, the standing and reputation built by its founders and by those who have labored over the years. The board holds in trust the school's future as well as its present; the board's collective judgment will affect how the institution can serve constituencies to come." (Stanton, 1989, p. 1)

Before the 1970s, the religious orders could say that principals, teachers, and other personnel could come and go but the order remained the same; now they had to face the fact that the order might not, in fact, be able to be the stabilizing factor for the future. Boards made up of lay men and women would be necessary to assure the continuity of the schools. But the purpose and responsibility of such boards was not clear at the outset, and there were few, if any, models from which to learn. The NAIS models, although helpful, could be of limited value because the models were designed primarily for single schools, not networks. There was therefore no provision within the NAIS guidelines for a common vision or a "system" while providing a governance structure for individual schools.

The National Catholic Education Association (NCEA) has, like NAIS, provided a guide to the development of school governance structures with A Primer on Educational Governance in the Catholic Church (1987). This booklet distinguishes governance in Catholic schools from governance in the public school sector. Specifically, the authors note that boards of Catholic and other private schools, unlike their public school counterparts, are governed by contract law. They are not under the jurisdiction of state statutes and constitution. This creates a different set of legal expectations for private than for public schools. The booklet then goes on to present several models of governance appropriate for single parish, consolidated and religious order

Catholic schools. Like the NAIS, however, the NCEA does not deal with the pressing issue underlying whatever formal structure is adopted: how does the parent organization maintain the corporate vision while delegating most authority to the individual schools.

Although the religious orders addressed in this study differ (sometimes radically) on how they proceeded and what they achieved, most of the orders have developed some variant of the two-tiered governance structure described in the NCEA Primer. In this two-level governance arrangement, the first level is the corporate board made up of selected members of the sponsoring religious order. This corporate board has reserved powers regarding such things as the alteration of the bylaws and the sale or purchase of property. The corporate board, however, delegates the actual governance of the school to the second tier, a trustee board or board of directors, which may or may not include members of the sponsoring religious order. The head of the school is hired or fired by the trustee board, but the corporate board often has the power to select or release trustees. In this way, the sponsoring religious order can maintain some control of the overall mission and direction of the schools, while assuring that the actual governance of the school is in the hands of lay men and women with more direct connections to the schools.

The variations on this two-level model are many and instructive. The Irish Christian Brothers have concentrated many of their efforts to support their schools on helping the schools help themselves.. The order can no longer afford to provide large numbers of brothers in the schools. Most principals of their schools are Christian Brothers, but there is an inevitable movement toward the day when many principals will not have been formed by the order itself. The Christian Brothers call their governance model a" Board of Limited Jurisdiction." As the Christian Brother president of Iona College wrote in the introduction to the model, "Schools are too precious to be managed by only one person. The principal needs a competent companion to effectively manage a school in this complicated environment. Effective schools need broad-based leadership." (Brother Jack Driscall in Stoldt, 1991, p. 1.)

Like other two-tiered models, the board of limited jurisdiction has power in certain areas, while there are other areas reserved to the religious order. According to the Christian Brother model, the board of limited jurisdiction is to be preferred over consultative, regulatory or jurisdictional boards because it "attracts more talented people . . . legally protects members of the board of directors . . . allows board to have final authority but not total jurisdiction." (Stoldt, p. 4) The powers reserved to the Board of Trustees (religious congregation) include:

(1) approval of philosophy and mission;

(2) maintaining the charism of the Congregation;
(3) approval of debts over a certain amount;
(4) ownership of property; and
(5) appointment of Board of Directors/Chief School Administrator.

The powers of the Board of Directors include to "evaluate, consider, analyze, recommend and/or approve:"

(1) policies on the operation of the school with a distinctly Christian Brother charism/purpose;
(2) policies on school finances (annual budget, teacher contracts, tuition and fees, development/fundraising);
(3) policies involving personnel;
(4) participation in the evaluation and selection of the chief school administrator;
(5) develop and propose long range plans for the future operation, maintenance and direction of the school;
(6) promote public relations;
(7) ensure the quality of teaching and learning; and
(8) ensure continuous institutional assessment.

According to the guidelines, "Board members are the guardians of the mission." (Stoldt, p. 9) But it is also clear that the board does not provide hands-on management of the school: "board members should approve educational policy; they should not interfere with the curriculum or the ways in which policy is translated into action. That is the job of the faculty. Board members should not meddle in management, but they need to be sure that the management is good." (Stoldt, p. 10). In other words, there are clear lines of authority and responsibility which should, but don't always, reduce unnecessary tensions between governance boards, administrators, faculty, parents and students.

Although there are some differences among provinces of Christian Brothers, the two-tiered boards described above appear to be central to their governance, with the Board of Trustees (the order) being a single board, while there are individual Boards of Directors specific to each individual school. The need for constantly re-evaluating and revising this model is stressed particularly in a governance/mission document developed by the Eastern Provinces of the Christian Brothers in the United States. The document, entitled The Call to Mission, The Call to Governance, provides the criteria by which schools should evaluate themselves or be evaluated by peers. According to the authors of that document, the relationship among boards and administrators "has to be continually revised. It is never 'finished' because the realities facing the schools and the brothers continue to

change. . . . Each year efforts must be made to review the relationship, revise it where necessary, and above all, to renew commitment to the vision that brought it into existence." (p. 11).

The Society of the Holy Child Jesus (the Holy Child sisters) has placed particular emphasis on the development of governance systems for their schools. This order of women religious was founded in England in the mid-nineteenth century along the lines of the Religious of the Sacred Heart. They have had schools in the United States for over 100 years. As they faced the crises of the 1960s and '70s, they chose to concentrate their energies on governance issues in their schools. Among the orders considered in this report, they have placed the most emphasis on this aspect of system maintenance.

Testimony to both their success in this and the interest there is in their experience was tangible at a recent national conference of Catholic school educators. A session offered by the Education Coordinator of the Holy Child Sisters, Sr. Eileen D. McDevitt, entitled "The Era of Sponsorship: Transition from a Ministry of Direct Service to One of Governance," was scheduled for a 50-person room in the convention hall. Well before the scheduled starting time, the room was full of interested participants, most of them the educational directors of their own orders' schools or provincials themselves. The questions from the overflow crowd gave evidence of the level of concern which exists among religious orders about governance. Some orders have found an adequate governance model to handle the new realities; many are still struggling to find such a model.

For the Holy Child sisters, the creation of Boards of Trustees actually predated the development of a network of schools. Unlike the Religious of the Sacred Heart, they fairly early faced the fact that heads of school would not always be members of the order. Prior to the mid-1960s, the pattern of personnel assignment in the order echoed that seen in other orders: the provincial appointed both heads of schools and faculty members. There was a common formation/education for the sisters, and a clear link with one of the three U.S. provinces. What Sr. Eileen calls the "common myth" of the order, based on the writings of their founder, Sister Cornelia Conley, was evident in a number of common customs and practices, as well as in a common examination given to all graduates of the schools.

With the changes of the 1960s, the Holy Child sisters began to see the need for something other than common formation and the provision of staff as necessary for the continued survival of the Holy Child schools. Sr. Eileen recalls that, as the number of sisters dwindled and the cost of the schools rose, there was never a direct vote/challenge on whether to continue the ministry in the schools. There was simply an assumption that, since the purpose of the order had always been to provide education, they would continue to do

so, although this might take on new forms. (Conversation with Sister Eileen McDevitt, April 1992).

In 1970, the General Chapter of the order mandated the development of Boards of Trustees in every Holy Child school. The top-down development of these boards is in contrast to what has happened in many other orders, where the individual schools often established boards before the order took initiative in this area. The bylaws for the boards were developed at the provincial level and were the same for every school. Half of each board was to be made up of sisters of the order. Six years later the three provinces merged and one set of bylaws was adopted by all the schools. But, again facing the facts, the boards were now required to be only one-third members of the religious order. Realizing that the heads and other school personnel might not be familiar with the function of boards, the Provincial Council sponsored a workshop for the sisters who served on the boards. There was not yet, however, a true network or any consistent training of lay personnel on boards. It would appear that there was still a great deal of reliance on the continued presence of the sisters in the schools, although there did exist an open acknowledgment that this might not always be the case.

In March of 1980 there occurred the first national meeting of trustees of all the schools, called by the Provincial Council. This meeting was also attended by the principal of each school. According to their own documentation, "This was the beginning of a concerted effort on the part of the Society to work with Boards of Trustees in a partnership for private Catholic education." Whether at this time or later, it became evident that the continuing influence of the sisters, the continuation of their charism, would be carried by Boards rather than by school heads. Further evidence for this is found in the fact that, in the fall of 1980, there were three regional meetings of all trustees. At the same time, the Provincial Council decided to emphasize the role of the laity in the schools and began actively working to form lay board members in the spirit of the Holy Child order.

As the order became more experienced with boards, and more aware of the dwindling physical presence of the sisters in the schools, there was renewed emphasis on "mission effectiveness" rather than control. That is, it became clearer that the order would have to clarify what the order and its schools were all about if it was to continue sponsoring the schools. There was a belief, not always articulated, that is was worthwhile sponsoring the schools and that the schools were, in fact, different from other private schools. All of the high schools, and all of the private (rather than parochial) schools were for young women. This, too, made them distinctive.

A School Committee, begun in 1985, further clarified the goals and criteria for Holy Child schools. All during this time, the Corporate Members continued to meet with the Board Chairs and to provide workshops for them

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and for the school heads. These workshops were on such things as "Collaboration between the Society and Boards for Development of Private, Catholic Education," "Trustee Recruitment, Selection and Orientation," "Annual Giving and Development," etc. The School Committee also started meeting with directors of admission and directors of exchange programs. In 1986-87, revised bylaws required only one-fifth of the boards to be members of the Holy Child order. At the same time, there was renewed emphasis on clarifying property issues--who owned what, including both the property and the "reputation" of the school. In what was a clear progression, the bylaws were again changed in 1989 so that only the Provincial was automatically part of the Corporate Member (rather than the entire Provincial Council); other members were appointed by her.

Sr. Eileen makes a distinction between sponsorship (a legal concept, involving governance and a corporate expression of the mission of the order) and mission effectiveness, although she says the two are often confused. The latter can be described as "what the product should look like, and whether it does." This involves the tradition, philosophy, mission and focus of the schools. The sponsorship issue was put to a test when the question was raised about "associate" schools; those which would have no members of the order on the administrative or teaching staffs but which wished to continue to be "Holy Child schools." This happened in Pasadena, Ca. At first, a contract was drawn up to formalize this relationship, but it was eventually dropped when it became clear that it was not necessary. But this experience did hasten the development by the School Committee of a document of goals and mission for the network. The Holy Child Society has chosen to work with the individual boards of schools to help them meet the criteria. A further support for this idea of mission effectiveness was the development of a handbook covering the history of the order and the schools, excerpts from the documents in that history, a copy of the 1846 Book of Studies, excerpts from General Chapters, bylaws, and so forth.

The Jesuits have been less active in governance issues than the Holy Child sisters. Although there are many links among the Jesuit secondary schools, each of these 46 schools is, in most senses of the word. self-sustaining and independent in terms of governance. Depending on the location within one of the ten U.S. provinces, the schools might have one- or two-tiered boards of governance. But there is no national requirement that any Jesuit school have any particular governance structure. Each Provincial (the Jesuit head of one of the provinces) has a Provincial Assistant for Education. These Provincial Assistants are in continual contact with the schools in their area and are supposed to be fully cognizant of their successes and problems. These Assistants meet together twice a year with the President of the Jesuit Secondary Education Association as one of the Association's commissions. At these twice-yearly meetings, there is a full discussion of the situation in

each of the schools. This provides an opportunity to share experiences and receive both formal and informal help from others in the field.

The description of the characteristics of Jesuit education developed over a four-year period by Jesuits from around the world (Go Forth and Teach, 1987) stressed the need for governing boards "with membership that includes both lay people and Jesuits" (p. 43) The document notes that, in the past, the Rector of the Jesuit community (an appointed position by the Provincial) "was responsible for the direction of the Jesuit school." That role of being entrusted with the responsibility for the school's mission "that comes ultimately from the Society of Jesus" (p. 45) could now be the responsibility of a lay person but remains "subject to periodic evaluation by the Society (normally through the Jesuit Provincial or his delegate.)" (p. 45)

The general guidelines for governance of Jesuit schools appear to be just that--general guidelines. The interest of the order is in ensuring the Jesuit character of the school. How this is done is largely up to the individual school. The "Characteristics" document provides only this requirement:

If the school is "Jesuit," then sufficient authority and control remains in the hands of the Society of Jesus to enable that Society to respond to a call of the church through its institutions and to ensure that the Jesuit school continues to be faithful to its traditions. Except for this limitation, effective authority in the school can be exercised by anyone, Jesuit or lay, who has a knowledge of, sympathy for, identification with and commitment to the Jesuit character of education. (JSEA, 1987, p. 46)

Some Jesuit provinces have been more active than others in providing guidance and support for the development of governance structures in individual schools. One province is now forming a province-wide Board of Members (the first tier of the two-tiered system) which will serve for all three schools within the province. Each school will then have its own Board of Trustees entrusted with the governance of the school. Only a limited number of powers will be reserved to the Board of Members, including opening/ closing schools, major building programs, and any changes in bylaws.

In 1985-86, Margaret Camarena studied a number of public and Catholic high schools in the San Francisco area. Her study of the organization structures of these schools included insights into methods of governance adopted by several religious orders. One, the Sisters of St. Mary Magdalena, had established a process whereeby the General Council of the order had direct authority over the school's Board of Directors, which included among its members several sisters of the order. Financial policies were established by the Board of Directors with the approval of the General Council; budgets developed by school administrators had to be approved by the Board and then by the General Council. But, according to Camarena's research, "the General

Council and the Board of Directors generally leave the administration and management of the school to the principal, unless serious financial problems arise." (Camarena, p. 137)

Another order observed by Camarena, the Brothers' Society of the Congregation of the Holy Cross, had adopted a similar model of governance. The congregation had delegated responsibility for the governance of the school to a Governing Board made up of parents and congregation representatives and "has minimal involvement in the daily management of the school." The Congregation, in common with other religious orders who own and operate schools, retains the authority to approve the Governing Board's appointment of a principal and the annual budget, and to audit the school periodically. (Camarena, p. 140)

Another study of Catholic school governance, this one focusing on a single order, was conducted by Daniel Skala (1987). His study of the Xaverian Brothers and their schools in one province traced the ways in which the demographic changes experienced by that order (e.g., loss of members and decrease in new recruits) and changes in the schools themselves led the order to adopt a new model of governance in 1978. Under the new model, the Brother Provincial serves as "corporate sole" and Chairman of the Board for each school corporation. In this role, he appoints the Boards of Trustees for the individual schools, made up of both brothers and lay personnel, although brothers are in the majority. (p. 93) This single-tiered sponsorship model, like the two-level models, is in marked contrast to the governing boards prior to 1970. These earlier boards, where they existed, were composed entirely of members of the sponsoring religious order. The changes in governance, like other changes at the time, were precipitated by both the loss of religious order members and the growing call to share responsibility for institutions with those who worked in and benefited from them.

During the early transitional period in Catholic school governance (from 1966 to approximately 1975), there were some observers who felt that the future existence of the Catholic schools lay in functional jurisdictional lay boards such as those common in the public school systems. However, and fortunately, others cautioned that the public school approach to boards of education was not without problems. As one observer noted, "A more moderate position suggested it would be wiser to learn from the difficulties which public school boards had experienced." (Skala, p. 52) Consciously or not, this seems to have been what has happened. Although the development of boards has not been without difficulties and losses, there has generally been a smooth transition from centralized authority at the order level to site-based authority, with responsibility at the school level being vested in a community board, while day-to-day operation and curriculum decisions are entrusted to the chief school administrators and faculty.

CENTRAL SERVICES FOR SCHOOLS

Some central services are provided consistent with the overall vision/mission of the school, but decisions are be made at the lowest appropriate level.

Within a typical public school system, the superintendent resides at what is sometimes called the "strategic apex" of the organization. (Mintzberg, 1979, pp. 24-25) He or she is the focus of pressure from both external and internal forces. The superintendent usually has some form of technostructure (e.g., planning, budgeting, and research offices) and other support services. Between the superintendent and the teachers (the operating core) comes the individual school administrators. But within a given school, the principal may actually be either just a link between the school and the superintendent (making the principal a part of the middle line) or he/she may be at the strategic apex of the individual school, making most of the key operating decisions. In other words, the school is site-managed. Much of the research has shown that the former structure is the more common, and public schools are usually structured as divisions of a larger organization. The principals are then the middle line in a larger organization (i.e., the school district), rather than the strategic apex of their school.

Recent reform literature has stressed the desirability of giving at least some decision-making power to those who are closest to the actual problem or situation to be addressed. (See Murphy, 1991, p. 11.) As indicated above, this is not often the case within the organizational structures used within public school districts. Finn and Rebarber (1992) write that there is a new emphasis on restructuring the schools, in "decentralization of control and decision-making from system-wide central offices to people involved with individual schools. This is a reversal of decades of district consolidation and policy centralization." (p. 182) However, a survey of Catholic diocesan high schools showed that the principals enjoyed a great deal of autonomy. (Ouellette, 1989) The central office provided support services to the schools along with professional development. A national review of all Catholic high schools found that the Catholic school principal typically had many of the responsibilities usually held by superintendents of public school systems. And, in addition, it was found that the teachers in these schools had far more control of classroom-level decisions than was typically found in a public school. (Bryk, Holland, Lee and Carriedo, 1984; NCEA, 1985) In other words, decision-making was assigned to the lowest appropriate level.

As the public schools have been highlighted in both politics and the press, the outside pressures on the schools have increased enormously. Everyone from the local candidate for the village school board to the President of the United States has gotten involved in diagnosing the

problems of American education and prescribing for its healing. Local boards, local and national unions, state offices of education, Federal agencies and programs, all join with the customers (parents and children) in demanding change. But there is little consensus about what changes are needed, and seemingly little willingness to trust the schools to solve the problems facing them. The External Coalition (Mintzberg's term for the combination of these forces outside the schools themselves) is divided--that is, there is no common vision or agenda. When this happens, the result is most often chaos within the Internal Coalition: low morale, conflict, power struggles, etc.

When most religious order schools were founded, subsidiarity (decisions at the lowest appropriate level) was a practical necessity rather than a theoretical ideal. When the first Sacred Heart school was opened in Louisiana in the 1820s, months could pass between contacts with the mother house in France. Jesuits, Christian Brothers and most other religious order schools were similarly isolated. The realities of time and distance meant that a school head, once appointed, was likely to be on his or her own for much of the time. As was discussed earlier, a common training/formation process was used to assure that readiness and reliability of these school leaders, along with specific written guidelines. These written guidelines, at the foundation of and supporting the training of school personnel, helped create whatever "system" existed.

For the Jesuits, the basic document for the direction of schools was the Ratio Studiorum, developed by Ignatius Loyola in 1586 and presented in a "definitive" form in 1599. Writing about the effects of this document, John B. Padburg (1971, p. 19) described the Jesuit schools as "really the first educational system in Europe." In support of this judgment, he wrote that "from one corner of Europe and the new world to the other, a similar education was being given according to standard practices based upon commonly elaborated and commonly accepted principles." The Religious of the Sacred Heart had a similar document in the Plan for Studies, prepared by the order's founder, Madaleine Sophie Barat, in 1805. For the first 100 years of the orders' schools, this Plan was frequently revised and updated but, even when it became static in the early twentieth century, it formed the foundation for a "system of schools."

Public schools during their early years were also much more "site-based" than they are today. There were few links between schools simply because of problems in transportation and communication. With the shrinking of the country due to the development of cars, airplanes, telephones and television, public schools and public school districts began to "federate"--to merge and to consolidate. (Meyer, Scott and Strang, 1987, p. 185.) But religious order schools did not follow this pattern. This was partly due to the fact that the schools were relatively far distant from each other; there were seldom more than a handful of schools owned or run by a given

religious order in any one city of any size. The consolidation of schools or groups of schools was not a ready option. Catholic religious order schools remained site-based.

During the stressful years of the 1960s, with the loss of members from religious orders, the rising costs of the schools and a shrinking of the student pool, the temptation was not to centralization but to elimination. If anything, most of the schools became more site-based, more closely identified with the local community and "market," rather than more centralized. Part of this was due to the need to survive and part was due to the renewed emphasis in the Catholic church on the principle of subsidiarity proclaimed in Vatican Council II. Echoes of this principle are heard in the address of Pedro Arrupe to Jesuit secondary educators in the United States in 1971. As the first of his "guidelines for renewal" of the secondary schools he suggested to Jesuit school leaders: "See your educational activity as communitarian. Each lay teacher, in accordance with his talents and willingness to serve, should share responsibility for the school on an equal footing with yourselves." (Arrupe, 1971, p. 3.) The Constitution and by-laws of the JSEA embody his belief, with Bylaw 22 reading: "Decisions, recommendations, and resolutions of this Association on any level--national, regional, or provincial--are to be adopted according to the decisions of each school." In other words, the school is the primary unit in the mix; the school, through its leadership, boards and faculty, is the final arbiter on matters relating to the school.

However, there are some functions which would appear to be most appropriately performed by a central body. Although this report concentrates on religious orders and their schools, a study of diocesan high schools can provide a helpful insight into those centralized services which might be of most assistance to site-managed schools. A study of the linkages between diocesan high schools and diocesan education offices was conducted in 1988-89 with the intention of discovering what services are usually provided to the schools by the diocesan education offices and how these services are perceived by the schools. Because of the relatively small size of central diocesan offices, these services tend to be limited and very focused. According to the survey, "principals are looking to the central office for more assistance with the difficult tasks of development, long-range planning, marketing, public relations, and funding for student-aid."(Ouellette, p. 159) But the single most often sounded "cry" for help from diocesan school principals (and acknowledged by central office staff) was in all aspects of staff development." (p. 162, emphasis in original.)

Bryk, Holland, Lee and Carriedo, in their 1984 study of effective Catholic schools, reported many of the same needs for centralized services. "Both elementary and secondary principals expressed the need for centralized services such as leadership training of administrators and boards, legal and financial advice, assistance on curriculum matters, and increased

opportunities for communication between elementary and secondary schools." (pp. 96-7) Thomas W. Payzant, Superintendent of the San Diego Public Schools, provides another list of desired characteristics if the schools were restructured: "The central office role would have to become on of motivating, enabling, facilitating, helping, and supporting rather than telling, directing, controlling, judging, and deciding." (1992, pp. 88-89.)

What services are provided by the central offices of the networks discussed here? For the Jesuits, as for other religious orders, the central "office" (in the Jesuit case, the JSEA) might be called an 'intellectual holding company." (See Quinn, Doorley and Paquette, 1992.) It is keeper of the mission or vision, the organization that tries to provide the links that keep the network alive without either running it or abandoning it. In forming the JSEA, the Preamble stated that ". . . the functions of the JSEA . . . should be attempted only if ... this Association can provide those unique services which will further the specifically Jesuit character of their educational efforts . . . assist in the
clarification, development, and implementation of particularly Jesuit approaches in their education apostolates, and that that should be its primary concern." (Preamble, 1971, p. 11.) The first of the objectives of the JSEA in the Constitution and by-laws proclaims that the organization is "To promote better faculty understanding of the Ignatian vision as outlined in the Preamble through scholarly publications, institutes, workshops, and retreats."

Earlier sections of this report provide examples of other workshops and models offered by "central offices" of the orders. However, all of these orders maintain extremely small central staffs and may use what might be called "field staff" to assist in providing technical support to the schools within the network. These field staff are usually experienced principals, faculty and board members, both religious and lay, from the order's own schools. They work either as volunteers, under contract, or "on loan," to provide assistance where needed. The director of the order's schools, known under a number of different titles, almost always travels extensively, moving from school to school to provide information, encouragement, and links with others having similar concerns or successes. This is the traditional, pre-1970 role of the educational director of most orders. However, today the "visitor" is more of a technical consultant and link to the mission of the network than a direct line supervisor or evaluator. The central office is small in size but, clearly, provides some critical services necessary to maintaining a network of schools within a specific tradition.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT

There is an accountability system appropriate to the site-managed system.

Organizations are complex, made up of diverse individuals, expectations, substructures and agendas. How is it possible to assure that all the parts of the whole, from the middle line to the operating core and the external coalition, are working together to achieve the mission of the organization? How is it possible to assure there is some control over quality, over what the Holy Child sisters call "mission effectiveness?" Direct, hands-on supervision is seldom effective in a professional environment (Peterson, 1984). Such direct supervision is also not possible in the context of religious order schools because of the extreme limits on central office personnel. Some organizations (including many local public school boards and state education agencies) attempt to control quality through the specification of outputs (graduation rates, test scores, etc.) or process (more homework, particular teaching methods.) Again, there is evidence that these methods are counterproductive given the nature of schools. So what is left?

Perhaps unconsciously following the lead of many professional organizations, many of the religious order school networks have adopted peer evaluation methods to assure "product quality." What this boils down to is a multi-step process which differs somewhat from network to network but has some common elements: the mission is clarified and stated in behavioral terms; the individual school develops its own mission based on local conditions and the larger mission; and a network is established to assist the schools to evaluate how each is living up to the mission and to assist in identifying needed changes.

The best articulated and most developed form of peer evaluation is seen in the schools of the Religious of the Sacred Heart. The Goals and Criteria for Sacred Heart Schools, first adopted in 1975, were discussed earlier in this paper. An experimental evaluation of schools according to these goals was conducted in 1976-77, but was not thought to be very effective. (McCarthy, 121). Thus, the National Committee on Goals and Criteria (NCOG) was established in 1978 and began to revise and refine the process. The stakes were high. With the establishment in the late 1970s of individual school boards largely made up of lay trustees, it became clear that the "only official link between the Order and the Schools" would be the NCOG. "In other words, a School was a Sacred Heart School only if it was evaluated by an NCOG team vis a vis the Goals and Criteria." (McCarthy, p. 126).

The evaluation process for Sacred Heart Schools has five distinct but interrelated aspects which are critical to its success:

(1) the evaluation is based on goals and criteria which are well known to all involved in the process;
(2) evaluations are performed by trained teams made up of five Sacred Heart educators, including faculty, administrators, board members, NCOG members and representatives of the religious order;
(3) the process involves both written documents and on-site visitation;
(4) the evaluation is cyclical and recurring, with each cycle lasting five years from initial self-evaluation through visitation to long-range planning to self-evaluation again; and
(5) the process is reviewed and revised as more information and experience is gathered.

With almost fifteen hears of history behind it, the NCOG evaluation process is becoming a more and more effective tool for assessing both accountability to the common vision and maintenance of unique site-managed institutions. Because this approach has been tested and improved over a couple of cycles and has proven to be successful in a number of different settings, it deserves more detailed discussion here. The outline below provides an overview of the ten-step, five-year evaluation cycle.

YEAR 1

Step 1: Self Study, including a Process (School community assesses the quality of the active orientation to and expression of the Goals) and a Document:

1. Narrative 5-year history of and by the school community
2. Description of the school's relationship to the goals
3. Areas of commendation
4. Areas for action
5. Description of how different parts of the community have been involved in the self-study

Step 2: NCOG's Review of the Self Study

NCOG reviews Self Study and generates a set of questions, known as NCOG's Review, that it sends to the school's evaluation steering committee, the Provincial Team (the leadership of the order) and the visiting committee made up of five members chosen to evaluate this particular school.)

This review is used by the steering committee of the school as it continues its conversation with the entire school community. The review, plus questions and answers generated at the school, are the focus of the visiting committees visit.

Step 3: School Community's Follow-Up

The school community reflects on the questions and review completed by NCOG and may generate a written response.

YEAR II

Step 4: The Visit

Members of the visiting committee are chosen by NCOG from among applicants from network schools. The committee is chaired by a member of NCOG and includes a Head of School (principal), a trustee, a middle-level administrator, and a teacher. The visit begins with a meeting between the school steering committee and the visiting committee on Saturday evening and ends on Wednesday afternoon.

Step 5: Visiting Committee's Reflections

The visiting committee prepares a written report on their reflections on the original report, the NCOG response document, and their experiences during the visit. This reflection is shared with members of the school community.

Step 6: School Community's Response

The school steering committee works with the school community to write a response to the visiting committee's reflections. This response is directed to the Provincial Team, with a copy going to the visiting committee.

Step 7: Provincial Team's Letter

The Provincial Team, in this step, exercise its responsibility and authority for holding each community accountable for the Goals and Criteria. This letter, which is based on the findings of NCOG and the visiting committee, along with the school's response, is sent to the Head of School and the Director of the Board of Trustees.

YEAR III

Step 8: Action Plan

The school develops an action plan as its description of what is intends to do to deepen the life of the Goals and Criteria in the school. This plan takes into account the school's own self-study and the priorities identified therein, as well as the various questions and responses and reflections which followed the self-study. The action plan must be specific enough to explain

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

why particular courses of action have been chosen and what the school hopes to accomplish.

Step 9: Commentary on the Action Plan

The Provincial Team prepares a response to the action plan, accepting it as presented or suggesting modifications.

YEARS III, IV AND V

Step 10: Action Plan Implementation and Update

The school implements the action plan developed by the school and approved by the Provincial Team, and makes modifications to the plan and activities as needed by changing conditions or experiences.

The peer evaluation process outlined above differs from a traditional accreditation process both in its objective (it aims to continually review and respond to the specific vision of an individual school within the network, rather than to simply judge if a school meets some pre-set criteria) and its process (it involves significant self-study as well as cycles of response and reflection involving significant numbers of people from the school community and the network.) It serves both as a means of holding schools to the network-wide vision and as a way to provide technical assistance or mentoring when these are needed. Although a great deal of work is required at both the school and the network levels, a large staff is not necessary at either level.

Skala's account of the Xaverian Brothers and their schools contrasted the pre- and post-1970 models of accountability and support. He recounts that in earlier times the provincial assistant for education, known as the supervisor of schools, visited at least twice a year all schools sponsored by the brothers for purposes of supervision and evaluation. His role included developing policy and overseeing its implementation. (p. 87) This model was common among most communities prior to 1970. One RAND director enjoys recounting tales of Sister Agnitus, the "provincial assistant" who visited his boyhood Catholic school. When she discovered through her own testing of students that they were not learning at the level expected within the order's schools, she responded rapidly. The director recalls the consternation of the resident sisters, the changes in curriculum and homework which were swiftly put into place, and the tension and anxiety in anticipation of Sister Agnitus' return visit. Her follow-up testing revealed a marked increase in the achievement of students, and tension subsided. But the expectations and the changes occasioned by Sister Agnitus' visit remained. In many orders, there was a related practice somewhat analogous to a relief batter or a designated hitter. When an individual principal or teacher was experiencing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

difficulties or was unable to carry out his or her responsibilities, there was a rapid reassignment among schools. Some sisters, priests or brothers were known as especially good crisis players and they were sent into a troubled school to put a classroom or a whole school back together. Other specialists were sent in to stabilize a volatile situation or to "ground" a young faculty. There was a fluidity among schools which could often permit those in leadership to head off problems before they affected a whole school or the entire network.

With the loss of religious in the schools, the role of the provincial visitor in evaluation was gradually discontinued. Without the resources to make rapid changes in personnel and without the authority to reassign lay teachers, this important role was dropped. However, the peer evaluation and visitation processes which have been substituted seem to provide some of the benefits of that earlier system. There appears to be an emphasis on the network offices as service providers rather than regulators or rule-givers. There is an attempt to keep the links between different schools in the network healthy and helpful. That is, there is an effort to link up the leaders of the different schools for mutual assistance. The emphasis is on support and encouragement, not control.

V. CONCLUSION

There are many differences between the Catholic and the public schools, and these differences are so many and so complex that there are always dangers in trying to adapt a success in one system to the needs of the other. However, the Catholic and public schools share the goal of educating American children to live productive and fulfilling lives. They also share the same basic structure of education and live by most of the same rules of teacher accreditation, length of school year, graduation requirements, etc. But their structures have, of necessity, developed differently over the years. Now, with the emphasis in the public schools on site-based management, the religious order networks have amassed a body of experience which might be helpful in the restructuring of old organizations or the development of new ones.

In general, what the religious order networks can offer are examples of how a network of private schools has been able to work together without a cumbersome centralized bureaucracy. With very few central staff members, and very little interference in the day-to-day operation of their schools, the Jesuits, the Religious of the Sacred Heart, the Society of the Holy Child, and the other religious orders have been able to create and then maintain a network of schools. Although the schools within each of the networks are quite different from each other, in keeping with their "market" orientation, they share a common vision, a common history, and a set of services from

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the order itself which can assist in meeting the goals of the schools. These services, which were all discussed in earlier sections and are directly related to the six principles described above, include:

1. The order or network is keeper of the vision, continuing to articulate and flesh out the mission of the school in the midst of the flux of modern society;

2. The network prepares and forms potential leaders of the schools, with a view to their eventual independent application of the vision in their own areas;

3. The network encourages the formation of community among all levels of the network, with special emphasis on teachers and other staff members in the individual school;

4. As keepers of the vision, the network supports the schools in their efforts to articulate the vision through common stories and heroes and celebrations;

5. The network supports a governance structure which will permit individual schools to run smoothly and efficiently. Decisions are made at the lowest appropriate level, with each of the schools in the network a self-supporting institution. Individual principals or school heads work with governance bodies to develop policies and procedures particular to that school but within the overall vision of the network; and

6. The network administrates an accountability system appropriate to the site-managed system. This system is based on self-evaluation and peer-review. It honors the need of the school for flexibility of meeting local needs while assuring the network the the overall mission/vision of the schools is being carried out.

Many of the largest school districts in the country, from New York City to Los Angeles, are welcoming the development of magnet or special focus schools which will exist within the school district, side-by-side with general purpose, traditional public schools. There are also individual entrepreneurs and educational reformers who are in the process of designing and constructing schools outside the public school system which might better meet the educational needs of today's society. Many of these new efforts aim to create only one "ideal" school, with the expectation that it might then serve as a model for other schools. Elmore and McLaughlin (1988) found that such models are seldom adopted by other schools. It might be more effective to build, from the very beginning, a network of related schools, with a common mission and some shared services, which can support and

strengthen each other. The networks of religious order schools might well provide examples of how this could be done.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arrupe, Pedro, S.J., "Letter" in Letter from Father General, Preamble, Constitution and Bylaws Jesuit Secondary Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1971.

Bryk, Anthony S., Peter B. Holland, Valerie E. Lee and Ruben A. Carriedo, Effective Catholic Schools: An Exploration, National Center for Research in Total Catholic Education, Washington, D.C., 1984.

Bryk, Anthony S. and Yeow Meng Thum, "The Effects of High School Organization on Dropping Out: An Exploratory Investiagation." American Educational Research Journal, Fall 1989, vol. 26, #3, pp. 353-383.

Camarena, Margaret M., "A Comparison of the Organizational Structures of Public and Catholic High Schools," dissertation, Stanford University, 1986.

Coleman, James S. and Thomas Hoffer, Public and Private High Schools: The Impact of Communities, Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1987.

Congregation of Christian Brothers, Eastern Province, The Call to Mission, the Call to Governance, mimeograph, ud.

Danzberger, Jacqueline P, Michael W. Kirst and Michael D. Usdan, Governing Public Schools: New Times, New Requirements, The Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1992.

Deal, Terrence E. and Kent D. Peterson, The Principal's Role in Shaping School Culture, U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, D.C., 1990.

Elmore, Richard I. and Milbrey W. McLaughlin, Steady Work: Policy, Practice, and the Reform of American Education, The RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif., 1988.

Finn, Chester E., Jr. and Theodor Rebarber (Eds.), Education Reform in the '90s, Macmillan Publishing Company, New York, 1992.

Hill, Paul T. and Josephine Bonan, Decentralization and Accountability in Public Education, The RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif, 1991.

Hill, Paul T., Gail E. Foster and Tamar Gendler, High Schools with Character, The RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif., 1990.

Hocevar, Rosemary A., An Investigation of the Internal Governance Structures of Selected Exemplary Catholic High Schools, dissertation, Kent State, 1989.

James, Thomas and Henry M. Levin, Eds. Comparing Public and Private Schools, 2 Volumes. New York: The Falmer Press, 1988.

Jesuit Secondary Education Association, Go Forth and Teach: The Characteristics of Jesuit Education, Washington, D.C., 1987.

_____, The Jesuit High School of the Future, Washington, D.C., 1972.

_____, The Profile of the Graduate of a Jesuit High School at Graduation, Washington, D.C., 1981.

Kaplan, George R. and Michael D. Usdan, "The Changing Look of Education's Policy Networks." Phi Delta Kappan, May 1992, pp. 664-672.

Lieberman, Ann and Milbrey W. McLaughlin, "Networks for Educational Change: Powerful and Problematic." Phi Delta Kappan, May 1992, pp. 673-677.

Mahar, Mary, Editor. NCDA/Ganley's Catholic Schools in America. Montrose, Colorado: Fisher Publishing Company, 1991.

Marsh, Herbert W., "Public, Catholic Single-Sex, and Catholic Coeducational High Schools: Their Effects on Achievement, Affect, and Behaviors." American Hournal of Education, May 1991, pp. 320-356.

McCarthy, Marina Chukayeff, The Anchor and the Wind: A Profile of Sacred Heart Schools in the United States, dissertation, Harvard University, 1990.

Meyer, John, W. Richard Scott and David Strang, "Centralization, Fragmentation, and School District Complexity," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 32, 1987, pp. 186-201.

Mintzberg, Henry, The Structuring of Organizations, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1979.

Mueller, Brother Frederick C., "Together and by Association: Lasallian Teacher Empowerment," mimeograph, address to the National Catholic Education Association Convention, April 20, 1992.

Murphy, Joseph, "Restructuring America's Schools: An Overview," in Finn and Rebarber, 1992, pp. 3-22.

O'Brien, Stephen J. (Ed.), A Primer on Educational Governance in the Catholic Church, National Catholic Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1987.

Ouellette, Francis M., "Interdependent Administrative Linkages between the Diocesan Education Office and Diocesan High Schools," dissertation, Boston College, 1989.

Padburg, John W., S.J., "Innovation and Institutions," in The Preamble: Historical Identity and Contemporary Discussion, Jesuit Secondary Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1971.

Payzant, Thomas W., "An Urban Superintendent's Perspective on Education Reforms," in Finn and Rebarber, 1992, pp. 77-108.

Peterson, Kent D., "Mechanisms of Administrative Control over Managers in Educational Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 29, 1984, pp. 574-597.

Quinn, James B., Thomas L. Doorley and Penny C. Paquette, "The Intellectual Holding Company: Structuring Around Core Activities," in Mintzberg, Henry and James B. Quinn, The Strategy Process: Concepts and Contexts, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1992.

Rowan, Brian, Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Sang Jin Kang, "Organizational Design in High Schools: A Multilevel Analysis. American Journal of Education, February, 1991, pp. 238-266.

Scott, W. Richard and John W. Meyer, "Environmental Linkages and Organizatiaonal Complexity: Public and Private Schools, in James and Levin, 1988, Vol. 1, pp. 128-160.

Sizer, Theodore R., Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1985.

Skala, Daniel E., "Governance of Private Catholic High Schools: A Case Study," dissertation, Boston College, 1987.

Stanton, Barbara H., Trustee Handbook, 6th edition, National Association of Independent Schools, Boston, 1989.

Starratt, Robert J., S.J., Sowing Seeds of Faith and Justice: Schooling for Christian Citizenship, Jesuit Secondary Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1982.

_____, "The Spirit of the Preamble" in The Preamble: Historical Identity and Contemporary Discernment, Jesuit Secondary Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1971.

Stoldt, Brother William M., "Boards of Limited Jurisdiction: A Governance Model for the 1990s," Congregation of Christian Brothers, New Rochelle, N.Y., 1991.

Talbert, Joan E. "Conditions of Public and Private School Organization and Notions of Effective Schools," in James and Levin, Volume 1, pp. 161-188.

Taylor, Barbara O. and Daniel U. Levine, "Effective Schools Projects and School-Based Management, Phi Dela Kappan, January, 1991, pp. 394-397.

Willms, J. Douglas, "Patterns of Academic Achievement in Public and Private Schools: Implications for Public Policy and Future Research." In James and Levin, 1988, Vol. 2, pp. 113-135.

Yeager, Robert J., Peter L. Benson, Michael Guerra and Bruno Manno, The Catholic High School: A National Portrait, National Catholic Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1985.

Other Available Working Papers:

93-4	The High Stakes of Low Politics: The Nordic Neutrals and the European Community, Leslie C. Eliason, Emily O. Goldman
93-5	Outreach for Entitlement Programs: Lessons from Food Stamp Outreach in Washington State, Richard N. Brandon, Robert D. Plotnick and Kelly Stockman
93-6 Revised	Meeting the Demand for Higher Education Without Breaking the Bank: A Frame work for the Design of State Higher Education Policies for an Era of Increasing Demand, William Zumeta
93-7	Who Gains, Who Loses from Changing U.S. Child Support Policies, Marieka M. Klewitter
93-8	Using Sister Pairs to Estimate How Neighborhoods Affect Young Adult Outcomes, Robert Plotnick and Saul Hoffman
93-9	External Third-Party Review of Significant Employee Concerns: The Joint Cooperative Council for Hanford Disputes, Prepared for State of Washington, Department of Ecology, June 1992. Project Team, Betty Jane Narver, Jonathan Brock, Gerald W. Cormick, Lynne Iglitzin, Drew Memmott
93-10	Employment Sales Growth in Washington State Employee Ownership Companies: A Comparative Analysis. Peter Kardas, Paul Sommers, Gorm Winther, Richard Marens, Katrina Gale
94-1	The Law and Economics of Cannibalism: Foundations of the Economic Analysis of Normative Issues. Richard O. Zerbe Jr.
94-2	States and Independent Higher Education: A Preliminary Report on New Surveys of State Policies Affecting Independent Higher Education, William Zumeta
94-3	Adolescent Fertility and the Educational Attainment of Young Women. Daniel Klepinger, Shelly Lundberg and Robert Plotnick
94-4	Evaluating the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit: A Review of the Evidence. James L. McIntire
94-5	State Policy and Budget Developments: Small Gains on the Fiscal Front But Clouds Continue To Build. William Zumeta
94-6	Political Prudence and the Ethics of Statecraft. J. Patrick Dobel
94-7	Saints, Sinners, and Politicians: Judging the Private Lives of Public Officials. J. Patrick Dobel
94-8	Developing Countries and the Net Welfare Cost of a Global Carbon Tax. William K. Jaeger
94-9	Decentralization and Effective Public Schools. Paul Hill
94-10	Private Voucher Programs and Effective Schooling. Paul Hill
94-11	The Lake Union Statement: 10 Propositions on School Reform. Highlights of a Symposium on Contract and Charter Schools and Systemic Reform. Sponsored by University of Washington Institute of Public Policy and Management and RAND Corporation.
94-12	Building and Maintaining Multischool Networks: Lessons To Be Learned From the Catholic Schools. Mary Beth Celio

For copies of working papers contact:

Working Papers
Graduate School of Public Affairs
DC-13 University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195
206-543-4900